

Remarks

Reconsideration of this Application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendment, claims 1, 2, 3, 4, 8-12, 14-18, 20-24, and 26 are pending in the application, with claims 1 and 15 being the independent claims. Claims 6 and 7 are sought to be cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter therein. Claims 1, 14, 15, and 26 are sought to be amended. These changes are believed to introduce no new matter, and their entry is respectfully requested.

Based on the above amendment and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Objection to the Claims

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 26 were objected to as being dependent upon a cancelled claim. Claims 14 and 26 have been amended to depend respectively from claims 12 and 24 in order to rectify this error. In light of this amendment, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

In the Office Action, claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-18, 20-24, and 26 were objected to for reciting conditional statements that do not always provide an outcome. Without acquiescing to the propriety of the objection, Applicants have amended independent claims 1 and 15 to accommodate this objection. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12, and 14

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,978,830 to Nakaya et al. (“Nakaya”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,145,017 to Yamaura (“Yamaura”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,145,017 to Ghaffari (“Ghaffari”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Independent claim 1 has been amended herein to recite, *inter alia*, “if processing of the first data completes before processing of the second data, moving the first interrupt indicator associated with the younger control record onto a second interrupt indicator associated with the older control record, wherein moving the first interrupt indicator comprises setting the first interrupt indicator associated with the younger control record to disabled and setting the second interrupt indicator associated with the older control record to enabled.” Without acquiescing to the propriety of the asserted combination, Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari do not teach or suggest at least this feature of independent claim 1.

At most, Nakaya discloses parallel computer parts that delay the issuance of an interrupt until all of the multiple parallel computer parts (e.g., U2 through U6) are finished. (Nakaya, col. 12, lines 10-62, and col. 25, line 40 - col. 26, line 12). However, Nakaya does not teach or suggest disabling a first interrupt indicator associated with the first data, *when the processing of the first data completes before the processing of the second data*, as recited by claim 1. Moreover, Nakaya does not teach enabling a second

interrupt indicator associated with the second data, *when the processing of the first data completes before the processing of the second data*, as recited by claim 1.

Yamaura and Ghaffari do not cure the deficiencies of Nakaya. Yamaura and Ghaffari are completely silent with respect to processing first and second data in respective processing engines. Consequently, Yamaura and Ghaffari cannot logically teach or suggest disabling a first interrupt indicator associated with the first data, *when the processing of the first data completes before the processing of the second data*, as recited by claim 1. Moreover, Yamaura and Ghaffari cannot logically teach or suggest enabling a second interrupt indicator associated with the second data, *when the processing of the first data completes before the processing of the second data*, as recited by claim 1.

For the reasons set forth above, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari cannot render claim 1 unpatentable. Claims 3, 4, 8-12, and 14 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Furthermore, dependent claims 6 and 7 have been cancelled by the above amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1, 3, 4, 6-12, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claims 2, 15-18, 20-24, and 26

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 15-18, 20-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Nakaya in view of Yamaura (“Yamaura”) Ghaffari, and in view of Pierson et al., “Context-Agile Encryption for High Speed

Communication Networks” (“Pierson”). For the reasons set forth below, Applicants respectfully traverse.

Pierson does not in anyway remedy the deficiencies of Nakaya, Yamaura, and Ghaffari with respect to independent claim 1, as discusses above. Consequently, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson cannot render independent claim 1 unpatentable. Claim 2 is similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson for the same reasons as independent claim 1, from which it depends, and further in view of its own respective feature. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Independent claim 15 is directed to a cryptography accelerator that includes the feature of “wherein moving the first interrupt indicator comprises setting the first interrupt indicator associated with the younger control record to disabled and setting the second interrupt indicator associated with the older control record to enabled.” As noted above in regard to claim 1, Nakaya does not teach or suggest this feature. Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson do not cure the deficiencies of Nakaya. Consequently, the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson cannot render independent claim 15 unpatentable. Claims 16, 18, 22-24, and 26 are similarly not rendered unpatentable by the combination of Nakaya, Yamaura, Ghaffari, and Pierson for the same reasons as independent claim 15, from which they depend, and further in view of their own respective features. Furthermore, dependent claims 17, 20, and 21 have been cancelled by the above amendment, thereby rendering the rejection of those claims moot.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 15-18, 20-24, and 26 under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn. Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment and Reply is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.



Robert Sokohl
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 36,013

Date: 11/24/08

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934
(202) 371-2600

859118_1.DOC